

REMARKS

In the January 31, 2008 Office Action, claims 1-6 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the January 31, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1-5. Further, Applicants have added new claims 7-16. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-16 are pending, with claims 1-5 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Interview Summary

On April 15, 2008 and April 22, 2008, the undersigned spoke with Examiner Chen, who is in charge of the above-identified patent application. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Chen for the opportunity to discuss the above-identified patent application.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,365,438 (Ishida et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004250 (Iketani et al.). In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iketani et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,378,774 (Emori et al.). In response, Applicants have amended claims 1-5.

Claim 1

In particular, independent claim 1 recites good interposer being selected and cut out from an interposer board tape or selected and cut out from an interposer board tape excepting blank sections. Further, claim 1 also recites extended electrodes are formed on the base

member to be arranged between the carrier tape and the base member, and that the carrier tape is arranged only on a side of the extended electrode opposite the base member.

It is stated on page 2 of the Office Action, and Applicants agree, that Ishida et al. do not disclose good interposer boards. Thus, the Office Action relies on Iketani et al. to show this feature. Although Iketani et al. disclose marking defective devices in paragraph [0055], Applicants respectfully assert that the boards on the adhesive sheet 50 have not been selected and cut out from an interposer board tape as claimed. Applicants respectfully assert that since the boards on the adhesive sheet 50 have not been selected and cut out from an interposer board tape, they are not "good" as claimed. Further, referring to paragraph [0058] of Iketani et al., Applicants respectfully assert that the boards that are selected are placed in holes in the tape 41. However, in contrast to claim 1 of the present application, Applicants respectfully assert that this configuration lacks a carrier tape being formed as an exfoliate layer because the boards are not disposed on the tape 41 as claimed.

As stated, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 recites that extended electrodes are formed on the base member between the carrier tape and the base member, and that the carrier tape is arranged only on a side of the extended electrode opposite the base member. On page 3 of the Office Action, it is stated that item 26 constitutes the extended electrode, that item 33 constitutes an IC chip 33, and that items 25 and 26 constitute the base member. However, as seen in Figure 11A of Iketani et al., Applicants respectfully assert that only item 25 is provided for mounting the IC chip 33 and that there is a gap between items 25 and 26. Further, since the extended electrode 26 of Iketani et al. is arranged beside the IC chip 33 and not on it, Applicants respectfully assert that arranging the extended electrode and IC chip 33 such that the carrier tape is arranged only on a side of the extended electrode opposite the

base member is not possible with a complete rearrangement of the components, which would destroy the teaching of Iketani et al.

Claims 2-5

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-5 recite that extended electrodes are formed on the base member between the carrier tape and the base member, and that the carrier tape is arranged only on a side of the extended electrode opposite the base member. The Office Action identifies the extended electrodes as item 26 of Iketani et al. and the base member as items 25 and 26 of Iketani et al. Applicants respectfully assert that Iketani et al. fail to disclose or to suggest this feature for the reasons mentioned above with regards to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully assert that Emori et al. are cited to show means for depressing the interposer board to an antenna circuit board tape to face antenna electrodes and extended electrodes as do not overcome the deficiencies of Ishida et al. and Iketani et al.

Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does not make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an apparent reason for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement.

Applicants believe that claim 6 is allowable for the same reasons claim 1 is allowable. Further, Applicants believe that claim 6 is further allowable because it contains additional features.

Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

New Claims 7-15

Applicants have added new claims 7-15, which ultimately depend on the independent claims 1-5. Applicants believe that claims 7-15 are allowable for the same reasons the independent claims are allowable. Further, Applicants believe that claims 7-15 are further allowable because they contain additional features.

Examination and consideration are respectfully requested.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-15 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Todd M. Guise/
Todd M. Guise
Reg. No. 46,748

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: May 8, 2008

S:\05-MAY08-SOS\TR-US065126 Amendment.doc